

REMARKS

This amendment is in response to the Final Action of February 4, 2005 in which claims 5 and 14 were allowed, claims 1, 7 and 11-13 rejected and claims 2, 3 and 8-10 objected to. It is noted that the objection to claim 6 on the Office Actions Summary is believed to be an inadvertent error on the part of the Office since the claim from which it depends, i.e., independent claim 5 has been allowed.

Regarding the 35 U.S.C. §102(e) rejection of claims 7 and 11-13 as being anticipated by Schessel (US 6,304,566), claim 7 has been amended to include the limitation of the objected-to claim 8 and therefore should now be allowable. It should be noted however that this amendment is made with the understanding that Schessel as a reference does not identically disclose the system claimed in unamended claim 7 because Schessel does not show using a relay for causing subscribers accessing the central office to access features of the central office acting "as" extensions of the central office, since the central office is not a PBX and does not have "extensions."

The only thing that Schessel shows is a subscriber who may be out of the office trying to access features of his PSTN telephone that are made available through his central office by means of an IP network. This is done by having the central office maintain a database with the available features listed for the subscriber and having the subscriber who is away from his office enter both the IP address of the central office, his telephone number (E.164) and a personal identification number. The central office then gives the subscriber, who is not at his regular PSTN office, telephone access to the special features of the central office via the internet.

The Schessel reference does not say anything about equipment providing telephony connections as well as telephony-related features accessible to a plurality of telephones connected as extensions thereof. Rather, they are full-fledged E.164 telephones, not extensions.

Nonetheless, applicant does not object to amending claim 7 to incorporate the limitations of claim 8 in order to advance prosecution and avoid the long delays caused during Appeal. Applicant reserves the right, however, to reclaim the subject matter of claim 7 in a continuation.

Withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §102(e) rejection of claims 7 and 11-13 is requested.

Regarding the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claim 1 as being unpatentable over Brivet et al. (EP 0 966 145 A2), in view of Nixon (US 6,584,185), the Brivet et al. reference is not available as a 35 U.S.C. §102(b)/103 reference since it was published less than one year before the December 15, 2000 filing date of the present application.

Withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claim 1 is requested.

The indication of allowable subject matter in claims 5 and 14 is noted with appreciation and the objection to certain claims has been addressed above by amendment.

The objections and rejections of the Office Action of May 4, 2005, having been obviated by amendment or shown to be inapplicable, withdrawal thereof is requested and passage of claims 1, 3, 5-7, and 9-14 to issue is earnestly solicited.

4 MAY 2005

Date

WARE, FRESSOLA, VAN DER SLUYS
& ADOLPHSON LLP
755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224
Monroe, CT 06468-0224

Tel: (203) 261-1234
Cust. No.: 004955

Respectfully submitted,

Francis J. Maguire

Francis J. Maguire
Registration No. 31,391